

that the proposed action is the preferred alternative.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

NRC provided a draft of this Environmental Assessment to PADEP for review on June 9, 2006. On June 14, 2006, PADEP responded by email that PADEP staff involved with both radiation protection and with watershed management reviewed the EA. PADEP agreed with the conclusions of the EA, and otherwise had no comments.

The NRC staff has determined that the proposed action is of a procedural nature, and will not affect listed species or critical habitat. Therefore, no further consultation is required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. The NRC staff has also determined that the proposed action is not the type of activity that has the potential to cause effects on historic properties. Therefore, no further consultation is required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

#### **III. Finding of No Significant Impact**

The NRC staff has prepared this EA in support of the proposed action. On the basis of this EA, the NRC finds that there are no significant environmental impacts from the proposed action, and that preparation of an environmental impact statement is not warranted. Accordingly, the NRC has determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate.

#### **IV. Further Information**

Documents related to this action, including the application for license amendment and supporting documentation, are available electronically at the NRC's Electronic Reading Room at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. From this site, you can access the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. The documents related to this action are listed below, along with their ADAMS accession numbers.

1. Amendment request with Erosion and Sediment Pollution Control Plan Revision 2, dated May 24, 2006 (ML061570151);

2. Title 25, Pennsylvania Code, Chapter 105, "Dam Safety and Waterway Management;"

3. Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 230, Section 404(b)(1), "Guidelines for Specification of Disposal Sites for Dredged or Fill Material;"

4. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 20, Subpart E,

"Radiological Criteria for License Termination;"

5. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 40, "Domestic Licensing of Source Material;"

6. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 51, "Environmental Protection Regulations for Domestic Licensing and Related Regulatory Functions;"

If you do not have access to ADAMS, or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov). These documents may also be viewed electronically on the public computers located at the NRC's PDR, O 1 F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. The PDR reproduction contractor will copy documents for a fee.

Dated at King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, this 25th day of July.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
**Marie Miller**,  
*Chief, Decommissioning Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region I.*  
[FR Doc. E6-12515 Filed 8-2-06; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

---

#### **POSTAL RATE COMMISSION**

[Docket No. MC2006-6; Order No. 1472]

#### **Extension of Negotiated Service Agreement**

**AGENCY:** Postal Rate Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice and order.

**SUMMARY:** This document informs the public that the Postal Service is seeking approval of a one-year extension of the negotiated service agreement with Capital One Services, Inc. The document describes the agreement, identifies certain preliminary decisions, and addresses procedural steps, including key deadlines.

**DATES:** 1. August 14, 2006: Deadline for intervention, statements identifying issues requiring a hearing, and objections to rule 197 treatment.

2. August 15, 2006: Prehearing conference.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Stephen L. Sharfman, general counsel, at 202-789-6820.

#### **Procedural History**

Capital One Services, Inc. Negotiated Service Agreement, 67 FR 61355 (September 30, 2002).

On July 26, 2006, the United States Postal Service filed a request seeking a recommended decision from the Postal Rate Commission approving a one-year extension of the negotiated service agreement with Capital One Services, Inc.<sup>1</sup> The Capital One negotiated service agreement was first recommended by the Commission on May 15, 2003,<sup>2</sup> and ordered into effect for a period of three years ending September 1, 2006, by the United States Postal Service Board of Governors.<sup>3</sup> The Request, which includes seven attachments, was filed pursuant to chapter 36 of the Postal Reorganization Act, 39 U.S.C. 3601 *et seq.*<sup>4</sup> The Postal Service asks that this case proceed under the Commission's rules for requests to renew previously recommended negotiated service agreements with existing participants. Rule 197 [39 CFR 3001.197].

The Postal Service has identified Capital One Services, Inc. (Capital One), along with itself, as parties to the negotiated service agreement. This identification serves as notice of intervention by Capital One. It also indicates that Capital One shall be considered a co-proponent, procedurally and substantively, of the Postal Service's Request during the Commission's review of the negotiated service agreement. Rule 191(b) [39 CFR 3001.191(b)].

In support of the direct case, the Postal Service has filed Direct Testimony of Jessica Lowrance on

<sup>1</sup> Request of the United States Postal Service for a Recommended Decision to Extend the Duration of the Previously Recommended Negotiated Service Agreement with Capital One, July 26, 2006 (Request).

<sup>2</sup> PRC Op. MC2002-2, May 15, 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Decision of the Governors of the United States Postal Service on the Opinion and Recommended Decision of the Postal Rate Commission Recommending Experimental Rate and Service Changes to Implement Negotiated Service Agreement with Capital One, Docket No. MC2002-2, June 2, 2003.

<sup>4</sup> Attachment A to the Request contains proposed changes to the Domestic Mail Classification Schedule; Attachment B contains the current rate schedules, which have not been modified from Docket No. MC2002-2; Attachment C is a certification required by Commission rule 193(i) specifying that the cost statements and supporting data submitted by the Postal Service, which purport to reflect the books of the Postal Service, accurately set forth the results shown by such books; Attachment D is an index of testimony and exhibits; Attachment E is a compliance statement addressing satisfaction of various filing requirements; Attachment F is a copy of the amendment to the Negotiated Service Agreement and the Negotiated Service Agreement itself; and Attachment G contains the decision of the Governors for the original Negotiated Service Agreement.

Behalf of the United States Postal Service, July 26, 2006 (USPS-T-1). The Request further relies on record evidence entered in Docket No. MC2002-2. The Postal Service's Compliance Statement, Request Attachment E, identifies the Docket No. MC2002-2 material on which it proposes to rely.

Rule 197(b) [39 CFR 3001.197(b)] requires the Postal Service to provide written notice of its Request, either by hand delivery or by First-Class Mail, to all participants in the Commission docket established to consider the original agreement, Docket No. MC2002-2. This requirement permits an abbreviated intervention period by providing additional time for the most likely participants to decide whether or not to intervene. A copy of the Postal Service's notice was filed with the Commission on July 26, 2006.<sup>5</sup>

The Postal Service submitted a contemporaneous filing requesting the expedited issuance of a recommended decision.<sup>6</sup> The Motion further requests that participants in this docket accompany their notices of intervention with detailed pleadings responding to an order to show cause why the term extension should not be recommended as proposed.

The Postal Service's Request, the accompanying testimony of witness Lowrance (USPS-T-1), the original Docket No. MC2002-2 material, and other related material are available for inspection at the Commission's docket section during regular business hours. They also can be accessed electronically, via the Internet, on the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>).

### **I. Background: The Capital One Negotiated Service Agreement, Recommended in Docket No. MC2002-2**

The Capital One negotiated service agreement includes two significant mail service features that form the bases of the agreement—an address correction service feature, and a declining block rate volume discount feature.

The address correction service feature provides Capital One, at certain levels of volume, electronic address corrections without fee for First-Class Mail solicitations that are undeliverable as addressed (UAA). In return for receipt of

electronic address correction, Capital One will no longer receive physical return of its UAA First-Class solicitation mail that cannot be forwarded. Capital One will also be required to maintain and improve the address quality for its First-Class Mail. PRC Op. MC2002-2, para. 2004.

Use of the address correction service feature is a prerequisite to use of the second feature of the negotiated service agreement, a declining block rate volume discount. This feature provides Capital One with a per-piece discount for bulk First-Class Mail volume above an annual threshold volume. The per-piece discount varies from 3 to 6 cents under a “declining-block” rate structure.

The Commission's analysis of the Capital One negotiated service agreement focused on assuring that the agreement would not make mailers other than Capital One worse off. *Id.*, para. 8006. To meet this condition, the Commission's recommendation of the Capital One negotiated service agreement included the addition of a provision establishing a cumulative three-year stop-loss limit on rate discounts of \$40.637 million. *Id.*, paras. 5116, 8011. The Commission found that the estimates of before-rates volumes for Capital One were so unreliable that without a stop-loss provision there would be no reasonable assurance that the Postal Service would not lose money on the Capital One negotiated service agreement. *Id.*, para. 8013.

### **II. The Request to Extend the Duration of the Capital One Negotiated Service Agreement**

The Postal Service proposes to extend the duration of the ongoing negotiated service agreement with Capital One by one year while the parties develop a new negotiated service agreement to be filed in the upcoming year. The Postal Service asserts that the Capital One negotiated service agreement has proven successful, benefiting both the Postal Service and the mailing community as a whole. The Postal Service and Capital One propose no other modifications to the currently in effect negotiated service agreement and indicate their intent to terminate the ongoing agreement once a subsequent agreement is reached. Request Attachment F at 2.

The Postal Service states that it is probable that no discounts will be earned in the third year of the agreement, but continuation of the agreement will serve two policy objectives. First, Capital One will be provided with an incentive to increase solicitations during the extension period. Second, Capital One will

maintain its contractual obligation to employ worksharing practices related to Address Correction Service (ACS) as well as its agreement to participate in mail quality programs.

The Postal Service asserts that the value from extending the current agreement will primarily occur from the use of electronic ACS notices to replace manual notices. The estimated savings from marketing pieces converted to electronic ACS notices in the extension period is \$5.1 million. USPS-T-1 at 6.

### **III. Commission Response**

*Applicability of the rules for requests to renew previously recommended negotiated service agreements.* For administrative purposes, the Commission has docketed the instant filing as a request predicated on the extension of a previously recommended negotiated service agreement which is currently in effect. A final determination regarding the appropriate characterization of the request and application of the expedited rules, rule 197 [39 CFR 3001.197], will not be made until after the prehearing conference.

*Representation of the general public.* In conformance with section 3624(c) of title 39, the Commission designates Shelley S. Dreifuss, director of the Commission's Office of the Consumer Advocate, to represent the interests of the general public in this proceeding. Pursuant to this designation, Ms. Dreifuss will direct the activities of Commission personnel assigned to assist her and, upon request, will supply their names for the record. Neither Ms. Dreifuss nor any of the assigned personnel will participate in or provide advice on any Commission decision in this proceeding.

*Intervention.* Those wishing to be heard in this matter are directed to file a notice of intervention on or before August 14, 2006. The notice of intervention shall be filed using the Internet (Filing Online) at the Commission's Web site (<http://www.prc.gov>), unless a waiver is obtained for hardcopy filing. Rules 9(a) and 10(a) [39 CFR 3001.9(a) and 10(a)]. Notices should indicate whether participation will be on a full or limited basis. *See* rules 20 and 20a [39 CFR 3001.20 and 20a]. No decision has been made at this point on whether a hearing will be held in this case.

*Prehearing conference.* A prehearing conference will be held August 15, 2006, at 2 p.m. in the Commission's hearing room. Participants shall be prepared to address whether or not it is appropriate to proceed under rule 197 [39 CFR 3001.197], and to identify any issue(s) that would indicate the need to

<sup>5</sup> Notice of the United States Postal Service of Filing Request for a Recommended Decision to Extend the Duration of the Previously Recommended Negotiated Service Agreement with Capital One, July 26, 2006.

<sup>6</sup> Motion of the United States Postal Service for Expedited Issuance of a Recommended Decision, July 26, 2006 (Motion).

schedule extended discovery or a hearing. Rule 197(c) [39 CFR 3001.197(c)].

Participants intending to object to proceeding under rule 197 [39 CFR 3001.197] shall file supporting written argument, if any, by August 14, 2006. Participants also shall file statements identifying issues that would indicate the need to schedule a hearing by August 14, 2006. The Commission intends to make a decision on these issues shortly after the prehearing conference.

*Motion for expedition.* The Postal Service's motion for expedition and to show cause is denied. Rule 197(d) [39 CFR 3001.197(d)] already provides for expedited treatment of requests to renew negotiated service agreements. Likewise, rule 197(c) [38 CFR 3001.197(c)] already requires participants to plead whether or not any material issues of fact exist that require discovery or evidentiary hearings at the time of the prehearing conference.

#### Ordering Paragraphs

*It is ordered:*

1. The Commission establishes Docket No. MC20056-6 to consider the Postal Service Request referred to in the body of this order.
2. The Commission will sit *en banc* in this proceeding.
3. Shelley S. Dreifuss, director of the Commission's Office of the Consumer Advocate, is designated to represent the interests of the general public.
4. The deadline for filing notices of intervention is August 14, 2006.
5. A prehearing conference will be held August 15, 2006 at 2 p.m. in the Commission's hearing room.
6. Participants shall file statements identifying issues that would indicate the need to schedule a hearing, or objections to proceeding under rule 197 [39 CFR 3001.197] by August 14, 2006.
7. The Motion of the United States Postal Service for Expedited Issuance of a Recommended Decision, filed July 26, 2006, is denied.
8. The Secretary shall arrange for publication of this notice and order in the **Federal Register**.

Issued: July 27, 2006.

By the Commission.

**Steven W. Williams,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 06-6653 Filed 8-2-06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710-FW-M

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

### Proposed Collection; Comment Request

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

*Comments are invited on:* (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

*Title and purpose of information collection:* Job Information Report, OMB 3220-0193. In July of 1997, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) adopted standards for the adjudication of occupational disabilities under the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA). As part of these standards, the RRB requests job information to determine an applicant's eligibility for an occupational disability. The job information received from the railroad employer and railroad employee is compared, reconciled (if needed), and then used in the occupational disability determination process. The process of obtaining information from railroad employers used to determine an applicant's eligibility for an occupational disability is outlined in 20 CFR 220.13.

To determine an occupational disability, the RRB determines if an employee is precluded from performing the full range of duties of his or her regular railroad occupation. This is accomplished by comparing the restrictions on impairment(s) causes against an employee's ability to perform his/her normal duties. To collect information needed to determine the effect of a disability on an applicant's ability to work, the RRB needs the applicant's work history. The RRB currently utilizes Form G-251, *Vocational Report* (OMB 3220-0141), to obtain this information from the employee applicant.

**Note:** Form G-251 is provided to all applicants for employee disability annuities and to those applicants for a widow(er)'s

disability annuity who indicate that they have been employed at some time.

In accordance with the standards, the RRB also requests pertinent job information from employers. The employer is given thirty days from the date of the notice to respond. The responses are not required, but are voluntary. If the job information is received timely, it is compared to the job information provided by the employee. Any material differences are resolved by an RRB disability examiner. Once resolved, the information is compared to the restrictions caused by the medical impairment. If the restrictions prohibit the performance of the regular railroad occupation, the claimant is found occupationally disabled.

The RRB uses two forms to secure job information data from the railroad employer. RRB Form G-251a, *Employer Job Information (job description)*, is released to an employer when an application for an occupational disability is filed by an employee whose regular railroad occupation is one of the more common types of railroad jobs (locomotive engineer, conductor, switchman, etc.) It is accompanied by a \*generic job description\* for that particular railroad job. The generic job descriptions describe how these select occupations are generally performed in the railroad industry. However, not all occupations are performed the same way from railroad to railroad. Thus, the employer is given an opportunity to comment on whether the job description matches the employee's actual duties. If the employer concludes that the generic job description accurately describes the work performed by the applicant, no further action will be necessary. If the employer determines that the tasks are different, it may provide the RRB with a description of the actual job tasks. The employer has thirty days from the date the form is released to reply.

Form G-251b, *Employer Job Information (general)*, is released to an employer when an application for an RRB occupational disability is filed by an employee whose regular railroad occupation does not have a generic job description. It notifies the employer that the employee has filed for a disability annuity and that, if the employer wishes, it may provide the RRB with job duty information. The type of information the RRB is seeking is outlined on the form. The employer has thirty days from the date the form is released to reply.

The RRB proposes no changes to Forms G-251a and G-251b.